



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRITISH MUSEUM.

A GUIDE TO THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE BRONZE AGE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BRITISH AND MEDIÆVAL AN- TIQUITIES.

(WITH TEN PLATES AND 148 ILLUSTRATIONS.)

[Printed by Order of the Trustees¹ (London, 1904). 8vo, pp. xii + 159.]

THIS shilling volume has its preface signed by a well-known archæologist, Charles H. Read, of the British Museum, whose work I take the volume to be; and though it is intended merely as a guide to a portion of the treasures housed in the British Museum, its interest to all those who have tried to understand the prehistory of the British Isles cannot be easily exaggerated, though some of them may possibly never have set foot within any of the Museum buildings. Among other things, Mr. Read is one of the first archæologists to try to correlate the results of his science with those of the ethnology of the Celts and their precursors in the occupation of Britain and Ireland. It does not come to much, it is true, but that is not the author's fault so much as a result of the intrinsic difficulties of the case; and it may prove useful to have those difficulties clearly pointed out from the archæological side.

There is also the advantage to the philologist of seeing his questions regarded from a different point of view from his own. Before coming to the instance here in point I may mention that the author alludes to movements in the Celtic world of the continent in the sixth and fifth centuries before our era, and suggests that they did not leave the British Isles unaffected; "but it was probably long before that date," he goes on to say, "that a branch of that widespread family settled in these islands." He alludes to the Goidel or Gaoidheal whose national name English orthography simplifies into Gael, and he thinks that the Goidel

¹ It is a pity that the author has allowed the Trustees an opportunity of showing their hopeless incapacity to give his book a brief and quotable title: perhaps after all a publisher might have been useful.

once occupied most of Britain south of the firths of Forth and Clyde. He would probably not have erred in dating his advent nearer to the year 1000 B. C. than to the sixth or fifth century. At all events, it was a long time before the next Celtic invasion of Britain took place, and here what has usually been regarded as one group of invasions is treated with evident advantage as two. Mr. Read's own words will best explain what I mean (p. 22):

The new-comers are known as Brythons, and it is from them that the name Britain is derived. A chronological limit for this second wave of Keltic immigration is possibly afforded by the express mention of Britain in the record of the voyage of Pytheas, a Greek of Marseilles who explored north-west Europe about the time of the philosopher Aristotle, towards the end of the fourth century B. C.; but the name may have been merely put into his mouth by Strabo, who quotes from a lost original. Some time before Cæsar's invasion a third conquest of this island by people with a similar language had taken place, and as he found the Belgæ in possession of the south, it is evident that by that time the Brythons, who had been steadily driving their predecessors, the Goidels, to the extremities of Britain and probably into Ireland, were themselves being pressed northward by more recent invaders who have left their name to Belgium.

Now, the name of Britain, ἡ Βρεττανικὴ (better ἡ Πρετανικὴ), is not the only name of importance here which Strabo puts into the mouth of Pytheas, for there is also that of Cantion, which survives in English as Kent and cannot have been, so far as I can see, derived in its form of Cantion from any Goidelic source. This and other considerations to which I had not given due weight make me accept with all the less hesitation Mr. Read's treatment of Brythons and Belgæ as forming two distinct groups of invasions of Britain. The early populations of the island would accordingly stand as follows: (1) the Aborigines, consisting of a dwarf race of mound-dwellers commonly called Fairies and invested with all kinds of impossible attributes belonging to obscure divinities; (2) the Iverno-Pictish population; (3) the Goidelic invaders; (4) the Brythons, and (5) the Belgæ.

The following paragraph as to Ireland (p. 146) is similar in its suggestiveness to the one already cited as to Britain, and it

agrees with conclusions which I have drawn from different data in a paper read some time ago to the British Academy:

The greater part of the gold ornaments exhibited comes from Ireland, but very few pieces have any history, and the archaeological value of the series is thereby impaired. It is significant that many of the gold-finds in England have been in the south-west, while Wales, also within easy reach of Ireland, has also been productive. The metal was not confined to any one district in Ireland, but was found or traded all over the island, which has been regarded as the El Dorado of the ancient world. According to M. Salomon Reinach, this industry of the Iberian population was ruined by a foreign invasion about 1000 B. C., and some Keltic-speaking barbarians (possibly the Goidels) arrested the development of Ireland till the advent of more invaders some time before 200 B. C., when the Late Keltic culture was introduced.

The early populations of Ireland may be classified as follows: (1) the Mound-Dwellers, living apart in the mountains and other remote parts of the country, resembling in some respects the reservations marked out for the Red Man in the United States of America; (2) the Iverno-Pictish populations, who were variously called Érnaí or Ivernians, Cruithni, and True Ultonians, and gave to Ireland its name of Eriu, Hiberio, Juverna, and kindred forms; (3) the Erimonian Goidels, of Milesian descent, or the invaders led by the Sons of Míl, for whose seizure of Meath—called after them *Mide mac Miled*, “Meath of Míl’s Sons”—the year 1000 B. C. will do provisionally well enough; (4) a miscellaneous group of invaders, consisting of Galeóin, Fir Bolg, Fir Domnann, Lagin, and others introduced by an early Dermot whose name was Labraid Longsech, or Labraid the Exile, in order to establish him in power in Leinster. Some of these were probably Brythons or Belgæ, and may have been mere mercenaries; at any rate, they failed, so far as is known, to perpetuate a Brythonic or Gaulish language in any part of Ireland. Labraid the Exile’s return with his foreign auxiliaries took place, no doubt, before 200 B. C.; the Four Masters date it so far back as the sixth century before our era. It is possibly to Labraid’s auxiliaries that we are to trace the cluster of small tribes placed by the geographer Ptolemy on the coast of Leinster between the Liffey and Carnsore Point. Some of these, though Celtic, were non-

Goidelic, such as the Brigantes of the southeast corner, and the Belgæ whose town, called Manapia, was somewhere in the neighborhood of Arklow in the county of Wicklow. It is remarkable also that one of these tribes was called Cauci, which reminds one of the Germanic people of the Chauci somewhere between the Rhine and the Elbe.

Thus the early populations of Britain and Ireland may be said to have consisted of the same racial elements; but the difficulty of associating the introduction of metal-working with any of the waves of invasion is at once apparent. Mr. Read produces excellent authority for the opinion that the Phœnicians were acquainted with the mineral fields of Britain between 1500 and 1200 B. C., and that the use of tin in Britain, probably also of copper, dated still earlier (p. 23).

The Phœnicians [he goes on to say], or those who traded with them, would not land in Britain and discover tin spontaneously; it must have been a knowledge that the inhabitants of Britain were already producers of this valuable metal that originated the commerce.

That is sound common-sense, but M. d'Arbois de Jubainville, in his recently published volume entitled *Les Celtes*, advances the opinion that it was the metal which induced the Celts first to invade Britain. Mr. Read is content to say (p. 71), that

the existence of moulds in this country, together with an ample supply of the constituent metals, shows that bronze was from the first manufactured on the spot. It is in fact likely that foreign traders in metal were first attracted to Cornwall and other parts by the knowledge that bronze was already in use among the natives, who had discovered the ores and the secret of smelting and combining them.

Accordingly, it would seem that the people who worked the metals here were either the Iverno-Picts or the Moundsmen, or both; but what our folk-lore always says about the Fairies is that they could not stand the touch of iron, which is not equivalent to affirming them to have been fond of working in bronze; so we seem to have to associate metallurgy with the pre-Celtic Picts.

This question is approached here from another point of view also; for Mr. Read refers to the map prepared by the Hon. John Abercromby for his paper entitled *The Oldest Bronze-Age Ceramic*

Type in Britain; Its Close Analogies on the Rhine; Its Probable Origin in Central Europe, published by the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland. Among other things, he notices how Abercromby's map represents the "drinking-cup," the earliest well-defined type of barrow pottery in this country, as occurring regularly on the east coast of Scotland and north England, with clusters also in Derbyshire and Wilts. He infers "that these vessels were introduced from Scandinavia or the Netherlands by a people scarcely acquainted with metals." Whether that people can be racially identified he leaves as a matter of doubt, but he thinks it the most probable hypothesis that they arrived before the Aryans. On the other hand, he goes on to make the following statement of his opinion (p. 25):

The Aryans who are credited with the introduction of cremation into Europe are now thought to have found the art of metal-working already established in certain parts, and to have actually retarded civilisation in the districts they appropriated. Such a view would suit the conditions in our island very well; and if 1000 B. C. be taken as a central date for the earliest cremation urns in the barrows, we may assign the "drinking-cups" and those "food-vessels" found with unburnt burials, and frequently with bronze objects, to the pre-Aryan population, in part descended from our remoter neolithic ancestors.

It is needless to say that I have not attempted to review Mr. Read's book: that would be far beyond my competence; but I hope that I have said enough to show the interest which attaches to some of the questions on which the author touches.

JOHN RHYS.

JESUS COLLEGE, OXFORD.